EIA Program Report for Fiscal Year 2011-12

Coversheet

EIA-Funded Program Name: **EAA - Technical Assistance**

Current Fiscal Year: **2011-12**

Current EIA Appropriation: **$6,000,000**

Name of Person Completing Survey and to whom EOC members may request additional information:

Dr. Montrio Belton

Telephone Number:

803-734-7213

E-mail:

MMBelton@ed.sc.gov

Question 1: History of the program: Please mark the appropriate response (choose one):

This program:

    ___ was an original initiative of the Education Improvement Act of 1984

    _X_ was created or implemented as part of the Education Accountability Act of 1998

    ___ has been operational for less than five years

    ___ was funded last fiscal year by general or other funds

    ___ is a new program implemented for the first time in the current fiscal year

    ___ Other

Question 2: What SC laws, including provisos in the current year's general appropriation act, govern the implementation of this program? Please complete citations from the SC Code of Laws including, Title, Chapter, and Section numbers.

Code of Laws:

EAA, SC Code of Laws Section 59-18-1500, 1510, 1520, 1530as amended 2008

Proviso(s): (If applicable. Please make references to the 2011-12 General Appropriation Act as ratified. www.XXXXX)

SECTION 1 - H63 Department of Education
Proviso 1A.20.

Regulation(s):

None

Do guidelines that have been approved by the State Board of Education, the Commission on Higher Education or other governor board exist that govern the implementation of this program?

    _X_ Yes

    ____ No

Question 3: What are the primary objective(s) or goals of this program? Please distinguish between the long-term mission of the program and the current annual objectives of the program. (The goals or objectives should be in terms that can be quantified, evaluated, and assessed.)

The primary objective of the Technical Assistance program is to improve school performance and student achievement by:
1. Allocating appropriate resources and support to schools identified as Palmetto Priority Schools (PPS).
2. Assisting schools in designing a revised school renewal plan to incorporate strategies and activities, supported by allocated Technical Assistance funds, which are designed to improve student performance as measured by the annual state assessment program.
3. Assisting schools in implementing the revised school renewal plan, as approved by the SC Department of Education, and assist schools in brokering for personnel as needed and as stipulated in the plan.
4. Monitoring student academic achievement and the expenditure of technical assistance funds in schools and report their findings to the General Assembly and the Education Oversight Committee.

The long term mission of the Technical Assistance program for these schools is to build the capacity and culture in these schools so that they are no longer rated as low-performing. And, to sustain an acceptable school rating as an enduring result of this initiative.

Question 4: In the prior fiscal year, 2010-11, what primary program activities or processes were conducted to facilitate the program's performance in reaching the objective(s) as provided in Question 3? What, if any, change in processes or activities are planned for the current year?
Examples of program processes would be: training provided, recruiting efforts made, technical assistance services, monitoring services, etc.

Answers should be specific to the process undertaken at the state level to support the objectives of the program and should be quantifiable. Please include any professional development services provided.

IF the funds are allocated directly to school districts, please indicate any data collected at the state level to monitor how the funds are expended at the local level?

*Please note that for 2010-11 the report reflects the Technical Assistance Program and the Palmetto Priority Schools Initiative.

Technical Assistance Program processes conducted in prior fiscal years to facilitate the program's performance, which were continued in 2010-11:
1. Training was provided to schools on how to conduct a thorough school level needs assessment and how to align activities supported by technical assistance funding to address the identified student performance needs.
2. Each district's Technical Assistance liaison was trained in how to develop and submit using an on-line application the revised school renewal plans that incorporate activities supported by Technical Assistance funding.

3. The Office of Federal and State Accountability Planning and Support Team and Accreditation Team reviewed, revised with the school staff as appropriate, and approved revised school renewal plans and the use of technical assistance funds.
4. Recruiting efforts were made to recruit exemplary educators to fill positions such as Teacher Specialist, Curriculum Specialist, Principal Leader, Principal Specialist, and Principal Mentor as defined in the revised school renewal plans.
5. As requested, the agency brokered the services of on-site personnel to schools with Unsatisfactory and Below Average report card absolute ratings.
6. The Office of Federal and State Accountability worked with district liaisons and schools to amend Technical Assistance budgets and school renewal plans, as appropriate during the school year, to address such problems as not being able to fill a Technical Assistance position described in the school plan.

The primary **Palmetto Priority Schools Initiative** activities or processes that were conducted in 2010-11:
1. Collaboration meetings provided professional development for principals, superintendents, board chairpersons, and on-site assistance, which focused on instructional leadership, curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
2. Recruitment opportunities were provided for all districts by forwarding information on regional recruitment fairs, by participating in college and university recruitment fairs, by working with the PACE program in the Office of Teacher Certification, and by advertising vacancies (state and national) through CERRA and Teachers-Teachers.com.
3. Training was provided to support the work of on-site liaisons, four PPS Turnaround School Teams, and Edison Learning Alliance Team Members(serving 5 additional turnaround schools), which focused on coaching and mentoring, along with the on-site observation of teachers and the instructional program.
4. Monthly visits were made to the schools by SCDE education associates to support the work of the on-site liaisons and to ensure each school's satisfactory implementation of the Plan of Action, as well as weekly visits being made to the Turnaround School Teams.
5. Monthly reports were submitted from each school's principal to document monthly "Next Steps" to ensure the ongoing implementation of the school's Plan of Action.
6. Monthly reports were submitted from each school's liaison or Turnaround School Team to evaluate the prior month's progress of implementation of the Plan of Action.
7. Public and private sector partnerships were established to assist schools with identified needs, to include college and university partnerships.
8. New State Board approved criteria for meeting Expected Progress was applied to all PPS schools and 21 schools exited the PPS Initiative at the end of the 2010-11 school year (Criterion One: Meet Adequate Yearly Progress AYP, Criterion Two: Increase the school's absolute value .1 point, and Criterion Three: Improve the absolute rating at least one level).

The changes in processes or activities for the current fiscal year 2011-12:

1. Strategic planning was conducted through SEDL and the Southeast Comprehensive Center, resulting in revisions to the PPS Logic Model and PPS Brochure.

2. Revisions were made in the PPS tiered system of support for identified schools to include naming dual SIG/PPS schools as PPS Tier I and using set criteria to select and fund PPS schools in Tiers II and III based on severity of not meeting school report card criteria (as outlined in Proviso 1A.20). In addition, the former PPS Turnaround Schools model (former PPS Tier I) was dissolved.

3. Revisions were made to the Plan of Action template to provide more examples of goals and strategies for PPS schools and districts.

4. Revisions were made to the PPS Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) document for clarity and to ensure that all stakeholders were engaged in the student achievement process.

5. The Office of Special Projects was dissolved. A new Office of School Transformation was formed to include many inter-related units: PPS, SIG, Charter and Special Schools, Single Gender, Montessori, SC TAP, and High Schools That Work/Making Middle Grades Work.

6. The Office of School Transformation and Office of Teacher Effectiveness will move to the same floor of the Rutledge Building to better facilitate both offices working together to provide more direct and sustained support to PPS schools.

7. The only Technical Assistance (TA) funds allocated this year (2011-2012) are for Palmetto Priority Schools (6 million dollars). Last year, the Palmetto Priority Schools Initiative was allocated 13 million dollars and had access to additional Technical Assistance funds to pilot programs in PPS schools such as Edison Learning Alliance, Save the Children, Children's Defense Funds, Pearson Professional Learning Communities, etc.

Question 5: In the prior fiscal year, 2010-11, and using the most recent data available, what were the direct products and services (outputs) delivered by this Program?

Examples of program outputs would be: number of teachers attending professional development seminars, number of and passage rates on AP exams, number of students served in the program, improvements in student achievement, retention and graduation.

*Please note that for 2010-11, the report reflects the Technical Assistance Program and the Palmetto Priority Schools Initiative.

The direct products and services delivered by the **Technical Assistance program** included:
1. 78 Technical Assistance district liaisons received training, and then trained at-risk and below average schools in the district. Training focused on conducting needs assessment and utilizing the on-line application for the submission of the revised school renewal plan.
2. The Office of Federal and State Accountability reviewed 434 school level technical assistance plans, worked with the district liaison as appropriate to make revisions to the plans, and ultimately approved the revised school renewal plans that included the use of technical assistance funds.
3. The Office of Federal and State Accountability provided 434 schools with individualized data profiles to support needs assessment activities.
4. The Office of Federal and State Accountability designed and published the Report to the General Assembly and the Education Oversight Committee on Proviso 1A.42, SDE-EIA: Technical Assistance Report, January 2010.

The direct products and services that were delivered by **Palmetto Priority Schools Initiative** for 2010-11:
1. Ongoing, year-long professional development opportunities were provided to 39 schools.
2. Teacher recruitment opportunities were provided through local, state, and national recruitment.
3. 27 liaisons and 12 members of four Turnaround School Teams provided on-site support to schools. In addition, 5 Edison Alliance Educational Specialists provided assistance to 5 of the 9 Turnaround Schools.
4. Various SCDE offices collaborated to provide support to schools and districts as needed (e.g., The Office of Literacy and Early Learning provided literacy training sessions to leadership teams from PPS schools).
5. Public and private colleges and universities formed partnerships with the schools to assist with specific needs.

Question 6: What are the outcomes or results of this program?

Outcome can be both quantitative and qualitative and should address the program's objectives. Please use the most recent data available:

Examples of outcomes would be: results of surveys, student achievement results, increases in participation, reduction in achievement gaps, loans awarded, textbooks purchased, etc.

*Please note that for 2010-11 the report reflects the Technical Assistance Program and the Palmetto Priority Schools Initiative.

In the 2010 Report to the South Carolina General Assembly and the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee on Proviso 1A.42, SDE-EIA: Technical Assistance: 2009 Student achievement data was not available for analysis. The 2011 Report will include 2009 and 2010 report card results for schools receiving TA funds.
The 2009 Report to the South Carolina General Assembly and the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee provides the most recent student outcomes were identified.
1. Of high schools that received technical assistance funds for two years, 82% showed an increase in their absolute report card rating from the 2007 to the 2008 report card, as compared to 61% of high schools that did not receive technical assistance funds over the same time period.
2. Of elementary schools that received technical assistance funds for two years, 63% showed an increase in their absolute report card rating from the 2007 to the 2008 report card, as compared to 54% of elementary schools that did not receive technical assistance funds over the same time period.
3. Of middle schools that received technical assistance funds for two years, 49% showed an increase in their absolute report card rating from the 2007 to the 2008 report card, as compared to 69% of middle schools that did not receive technical assistance funds over the same time period.

Palmetto Priority Schools Initiative outcomes based on 2010 report card data:
1. 21 schools met Expected Progress.
2. 3 schools made AYP.
3. 13 of the 39 schools improved their absolute rating from at-risk to below average on the annual school report cards.
4. 2 of the 39 schools improved their absolute rating from at-risk to average on the annual school report cards.
5. 4 schools exited the PPS Initiative by making at least .10 gain on the school's absolute rating.
6. 26 of the 39 schools showed growth on the annual report card absolute index.
7. All 39 schools met Satisfactory Implementation.

Question 7: Program Evaluations

What was the date of the last external or internal evaluation of this program?

Has an evaluation ever been conducted?

      _____ **Yes**

      _X_ **No**

If an evaluation was conducted, what were the results and primary recommendations of the most recent evaluation?

Can you provide a URL link, electronic version, or hard copy of this evaluation to the EOC?

      _____ **Yes**

      _X_ **No**

If yes, please provide URL link here.

If no, why not?

Question 8:

While EIA revenues increased in 2010-11 over the prior fiscal year and no mid-year cuts were made to any EIA programs, programs and agencies continue to implement conservative budget practices.

Please describe how the program and/or organization would absorb or offset potential EIA reductions totaling 5%, and 10% in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2011-12?

To absorb or offset potential EIA reductions totaling 5% for Fiscal Year 2011-12, $300,000 of the $6,000,000 PPS funds has been reserved for Emergencies/Budget Cuts in the PPS Budget. Due to the PPS budget being cut from 13 million last year to 6 million this year with further loss of additional Technical Assistance funds, it is extremely hard to plan for a potential 10% reduction in EIA funding. The Office of School Transformation has already budgeted/allocated $5,441,480.00 directly to the schools to fund the strategies for school transformation outlined in the Plans of Action. The budget for PPS schools has been cut significantly ($57M to $6M) over the last few years. Additional cuts would diminish SCDEs ability to positively impact student achievement and improve PPS performance.

Question 9:

If no additional EIA revenues were appropriated to this program in Fiscal Year 2012-13 above the current year's appropriation level, how would the objectives, activities and priorities of this program change?

Please be specific to address the impact to students, teachers or schools. Are there regulatory or statutory changes that you would recommend to the legislature that would assist this program/organization in meeting its objectives?

The average allocation to schools designated as "Unsatisfactory" has declined from an average of $496,348 in 2006-07 to $223,108 for 2011-12, a reduction of 55%. The average allocation to schools designated as "Below Average" declined from an average of $134,808 in 2006-07 to $74,500 for 2010-11, a reduction of 45%. For the 2011-12 school-year, no Technical Assistance funds are allocated to schools designated as "Below Average".

Concerns related to the PPS budget and program include: 1) not assisting feeder schools of designated PPS schools, 2) not assisting "below-average" or "at-risk" schools, 3) the reduction the program has already made to the number of days liaisons are providing on-site technical assistance support to PPS schools(average of 40-55 days per semester last year and 19-25 days per semester this year).

Meeting the objective of the PPS Initiative is complicated by the language in Proviso 1A.22. It seems contradictory to the language of Proviso 1A.20. Language indicating that special flexing of funds does **not** apply to PPS Technical Assistance funds earmarked specifically for school transformation as directed by SC Code Ann. Section 59-18-1520 of the EAA

of 1998, the 2011-12 Proviso 1A.20, and the 2011-12 PPS Memorandum of Agreement would assist the Office of School Transformation in meeting its goals.

If you want to provide supporting documents or evaluation reports, either reference a website below or email the report directly to mbarton@eoc.sc.gov.